

10, 1829, addressed to Dr. Griffith, stating that his plates for parts one and two of the *American Conchology* were struck off and waited only the completion of the letter press. It is supposed that another copy of this work with uncolored plates is in the Carnegie Museum library but so far it has not been located.

The author expresses his appreciation to all correspondents who have so kindly responded to his request for information.

FURTHER NOTES ON *ARCHACHATINA*

BY J. BEQUAERT AND W. J. CLENCH
Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, Mass.

1. Our recent revision of *Archachatina* (1936, Rev. Zool. Bot. Afric., XXIX, pp. 73-96) groups the species into three subgenera. In naming these we overlooked, however, that Pilsbry, some years ago (1919, *The Nautilus*, 32, p. 99, footnote 3), divided the genus into two groups, *Archachatina*, proper, restricted to *A. bicarinata* (Bruguière); and the subgenus *Calachatina* for the remaining species, with *A. marginata* (Swainson) as type. Our subgenus *Megachatina*, having the same type, becomes a synonym of *Calachatina*. That name has been completely ignored thus far. It is not listed in the Index to vol. 32 of *The Nautilus*, in the *Zoological Record*, in Thiele's "Handbuch der Weichtierkunde," and in the "Nomenclator Animalium Generum et Subgenerum" now being published in Berlin.

2. Our new subgeneric names were unfortunately spelled in two ways in our paper. We must therefore state that the spelling as it appears first should be retained (p. 76): *Megachatina* (not *Magachatina*, as on p. 78) and *Megachatinopsis* (not *Megachatinops*, as on p. 87).

3. Mr. H. A. Rehder informs us that, strictly speaking, Herrmannsen did not designate the type of *Archachatina*, since he did not use the word "type" in his Supplement of 1852, as he did in the earlier two parts of the "Index." It may be more correct to date the designation of *A. bicarinata* as the genotype from Pilsbry (1904, *Man. of Conchology*, XVII, p. 104).

4. We have recently received from Mr. G. Schwab a large lot of *Archachatina* collected at Edea, Cameroon. It included five speci-

mens of *A. adelinae* Pilsbry. In comparing these with other specimens in our Museum, we discovered that we had been mistaken in regarding *Achatina modestior* O. Boettger as a synonym of *A. adelinae*. We were misled, first, by Boettger's referring to his *modestior* the snails from Cameroon (Etome and Bonge) which d'Ailly had called *A. knorrii*. Two of these, from Etome, now before us, are unquestionably *adelinae* Pilsbry. In the second place, Pilsbry stated in 1905 that his *adelinae* "seemed to be quite identical" with *modestior*; but he had evidently not compared specimens. A more careful study of two paratypes of *modestior*, as well as of the original description and figures of that species, leaves no doubt that it is a valid species of *Archachatina*. Of true *adelinae* we have now before us specimens from "West Africa," Gaboon and Cameroon (Etome; Bakundu Kaki near the Elephant Lake; Edea). Of *modestior* we have seen, besides two paratypes from Bibundi, two specimens from Moliwe Plantation near Victoria (both localities in Cameroon). The specimens from Yaunde and Kribi, listed in our paper as *adelinae*, are not now available and may have been either species.

5. Our *Archachatina adelinae* var. *candefacta* is a form of *modestior*, not of *adelinae*. It should be called *Archachatina modestior* var. *candefacta*.

NOTE ON UNREPORTED MARINE MOLLUSCS FROM SANIBEL, FLORIDA

Editor of the NAUTILUS:

Dredging operations in the Gulf of Mexico from one half to fifteen miles off shore from Sanibel and Captiva Islands, and in from three to seven fathoms of water, have yielded specimens of species listed below which have not been reported from this locality so far as we are able to find.

Living specimens were taken except where noted.

- Arca auriculata* Lamarek
- Astraca brevispina* Lamarek. Dead shell
- Caecum carmenense* de Folin
- Calliostoma* sp.
- Cancellaria conradina* Dall
- Cardiomya* sp.